BRILL

Oriens 40 (2012) 477–513

ORIENS

brill.com/orie

Some Observations about Hermannus Alemannus' Citations of Avicenna's *Book of the Rhetoric*[*]

Gaia Celli
Pisa

Abstract
This article discusses the interplay between Hermannus' version of Aristotle and his citations from Avicenna, looking both at the translator's statements and at his practice. I concentrate firstly on the various degrees of literality Hermannus employs when he deals with his different authors, and secondly on the principles that guide him in deciding which source to select in different contexts. Finally, I discuss whether and how this translation could be used to improve the Arabic editions of the *Rhetoric* and of the *Book of the Cure*, and what this might tell us about the early transmission of these texts.

Keywords
Hermannus Alemannus, *Rhetoric*, Avicenna, Aristotle, translation

Hermannus Alemannus, who was active in Castile around the middle of the thirteenth century, mainly translated Arabic versions of Aristotelian works concerned with poetry, rhetoric, and ethics, along with Arabic commentaries about the same subjects.[1] In particular, his work dealing with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is remarkable because it intersperses the Arabic version of Aristotle's treatise that we also find in the *Parisinus Arabus 2346* with citations mainly taken from

*) Most of what is interesting in this article is here on account of the help I received from various people: Prof. Amos Bertolacci, who suggested that I could write it and who followed the whole elaboration process, Prof. Maroun Aouad, who gave me many useful suggestions about how to tackle the Arabic textual problems, Prof. Giulia Ammannati, who helped me very much in establishing Hermannus' Latin text, Prof. Del Punta, and Dr. Frédérique Woerther. Moreover, a draft of this paper was read at the 19–20/04/2012 ENS-SNS doctoral workshop, where it largely benefited from the observations made by Prof. Marwan Rashed and by all the participants. Of course, all the errors and inexactitudes that can be found in the article are still my own doing. Gaia Celli, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, gaia.celli@sns.it.

1) Actually, the version of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is ascribed to this translator on stylistic ground: see Anna Akasoy and Alexander Fidora, "Hermannus Alemannus und die alia translatio der Nikomachischen Ethik," *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 44 (2002), and Dag N. Hasse, *Latin Averroes Translations of the First Half of the Thirteenth century* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2010).

© Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2012 DOI: 10.1163/18778372-00402010

Averroes' *Middle Commentary* and Avicenna's *Book of the Cure*, and, at a lesser extent, from Al-Fārābī.[2]

This work is preserved by three manuscripts, the *Parisinus Latinus 16673*, the *Toletanus 47.15*, and the *Laurentianus Plut. 90 Sup. 64*,[3] and still lacks a critical edition, although one is being prepared by Dr. Frédérique Woerther at the Paris CNRS. When not otherwise stated, the ensuing citations follow the page numbering of the Paris manuscript. However, since I will proceed to analyze *Kitāb al-Ḫiṭāba* 73,7–75,15 and its Latin version more closely, in the appendix to this article (section 5) I have added a working text of the corresponding section of Hermannus' version and an English translation of its Arabic original. These two texts are also broken up into short numbered sections, so that each section of the Latin version mirrors one section of Avicenna's text. Whenever in the following article I will refer to *Kitāb al-Ḫiṭāba* 73,7–75,15 and its translation by Hermannus, I will do so on the basis of the division proposed in the appendix and its numbering.

In the following pages I discuss the interplay between Hermannus' translation of Aristotle and his citations from Avicenna, looking both at Hermannus' own statements and at his practice. I wish to focus firstly on the various degrees of literality Hermannus employs when he deals with his different authors (sections 1 and 2), and secondly on the principles that guide him in deciding which source to select in different contexts (section 3). Finally, I will add some thoughts on whether Hermannus' version could be used to improve the Arabic editions of the *Rhetoric* and of the *Book of the Cure*, and on what this might tell us about their early transmission (section 4).

1. Hermannus' Statements on His Own Translations

As shown by Boggess,[4] there is evidence for three translations by Hermannus related to the last two books of the Arabic *Organon*:[5] one from Al-Fārābī's works on the *Rhetoric*—which include a *divisio textus* and explanatory material—one from Averroes' commentary on the *Poetics*, and one—with which I am concerned here—mainly from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* itself.

---

2) I take most information about Arabic commentaries to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* from Maroun Aouad, "La *Rhétorique*: tradition syriaque et arabe," in *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, ed. by Richard Goulet and Pierre Hadot (Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 1989).

3) This manuscript only encompasses Hermannus' Averroistic citations.

4) See William F. Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus' Rhetorical Translations," *Viator* 2 (1970).

5) Evidence for the translation of the *Rhetoric* comes from manuscripts sources only, while evidence for Averroes' *Middle Commentary* to the *Poetics* and al-Fārābī's commentary on the *Rhetoric* is based upon manuscript texts and a 1481 printed edition from Venice.

In their manuscript copies, all these works are coupled with a foreword by the translator.[6] While the short prologue to Al-Fārābī's text focuses exclusively on the content of the book and its usefulness, the introductions to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and to Averroes' *Poetics* give us some insight concerning Hermannus' intentions.

1.1. *Citations from Arabic Commentators*

To begin with, introducing the *Rhetoric*, Hermannus states that he envisages the translations of this treatise and of the *Poetics* as a global project whose goal is to make the whole of the *Organon* available to Latin readers. The wording also implies that Hermannus' original plan was to translate Aristotle's *Poetics* rather than Averroes' commentary. At the same time, in 65^{rb}4–8 Hermannus complains about the complexity of his task:

> Nec miretur quisquam vel indi/gnetur [**5**] de difficultate vel quasi rudita/te translationis, nam multo difficilius/ et rudius ex greco in arabicum est transla/ta.

Further on, at lines 65^{rb}25–65va22, Hermannus dwells on the possible consequences of such difficulties:

> [**25**] Veniam igitur concedant qui forsitan non/ immerito poterunt hunc meum laborem de/ imperfectione redarguere ...
>
> ... sed potest, quoquomodo/ his[7] habitis per paulativa[8] incrementa, finis/ tandem desiderate perfectionis facilius/ impertiri, quemadmodum contingit in/ libro Nichomachie quem latini E/thicam [**10**] Aristotilis appellant. Nam et hunc/ prout potui in latinum verti eloquium/ ex arabico. Et postmodum reve/rendus pater magister Robertus, grossi ca/pitis, sed subtilis intellectus, Linkonien/sis [**15**] episcopus, ex primo fonte unde ema/naverat, greco videlicet, ipsum est com/pletius interpretatus et grecorum commen/tis proprias annectens notulas commen/tatus.
>
> Sic, si totius scientie largitori/ [**20**] placuerit, contingere poterit in his opus/culis primordialiter a nobis, etsi debi/liter, elaboratis ...

---

6) The prologue to al-Fārābī's text can be found in Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus," 249, and the prologue to Averroes' *Poetics* in Georges Lacombe et al., *Aristoteles latinus: codices* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), I.212–213, while the prologue to the Aristotelian *Rhetoric* is in both sources.

7) The word *his* is missing from the Paris manuscript, but it is in the Toledo manuscript.

8) Both the Toledo and the Paris manuscripts read *paulatina*, but the adjective *paulatinus* does not appear in any lexicographical corpus I could check. Even if the Spanish adjective *paulatino-na* does mean *gradual*, I would rather settle for the emendation *paulativa*, from the adjective *paulativus*, listed by Du Cange. The lexicographer quotes the "De gratiis et virtutibus beatae et gloriosae semper V. Mariae," a treatise by Engelbert of Admont, who was born in Styria some decades after Hermannus. See *Aristoteles latinus: codices* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), I.211–212.

Hermannus wishes that those who will be offended by the roughness of his translation will accept it as a provisional tool, until someone else will provide a better one from the Greek original. However, he also describes the already available work by Robertus Grosseteste as a compound of a Greek-based translation and commentaries taken from Greek authors. Boggess[9] argues that it is in this very respect that the word *sic* likens Robertus' and Hermannus' versions, so that the translator's words should be taken to mean *complete interpretatus et arabum commentis proprias annectens notulas commentatus sum*. This statement would be backed up by the fact that our text is indeed often interrupted by explanatory citations from Al-Fārābī, Avicenna, and Averroes, all of whom are named in the translator's prologue. However, since the main subject of the passage is the provisional character of faulty translations, which will subsequently be replaced by better ones, rather than the necessity of supplementing them with commentaries, I do not believe that *sic* can be interpreted in the sense wished by Boggess. The word *primordialiter* in the following line also suggests that what the author is now interested in is the possibility that at a later stage someone will be able to produce a better translation of the *Rhetoric*, thanks to access to Greek sources.

Accordingly, I must come to the conclusion that in this foreword Hermannus does not announce his intention of adding passages from Arabic commentators to the Latin translation, even if this is definitely what the readers will see him doing later on.

Hermannus writes explicitly about making use of Arabic commentators when introducing the first Avicennian citation instead, since in 77ra20–22, after stating that Aristotle's text is here incomprehensible, he adds that after this passage he will insert something from the *Book of the Cure*: *post ipsum ad eius elucidationem textum Aviscenne ex libro suo Asschiphe subiungere usque ad finem capituli*. On the other hand, Averroes' citations are systematically but briefly introduced by the name of the commentator, sometimes preceded by the verb *dixit*.[10] The same device—namely the insertion of the *inquit translator* phrase—holds for Hermannus' editorial insertions occurring within Aristotle's text.

Al-Fārābī's citations are usually brief, but those from Avicenna and Averroes are full-fledged citations, which, even if not always literal,[11] run from a few lines to some pages in length.

---

9) See Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus," 247.

10) The only exception to this rule is the citation from Averroes which appears in 77^{r} of the Paris manuscript and in 38va of the Toledo manuscript, wrongly attributed to Avicenna.

11) On Hermannus' non-literal approach to Averroes' texts, see Frédérique Woerther, "Les citations du Commentaire moyen à la *Rhétorique* d' Aristote par Averroès dans la traduction arabo-latine de la *Rhétorique* d' Aristote par Hermann l' Allemand," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph* (forthcoming).

Averroes' citations by far outnumber those of Avicenna: Boggess counted thirteen of the former and only two of the latter.[12] Avicenna's citations are however longer than those from Averroes. Boggess' systematical census of the Averroistic passages stops at 76^{rb}, but Woerther's contribution on Hermannus and Averroes will show that there actually are no more sections from the *Middle Commentary* in our text,[13] even if some citations of al-Fārābī will follow and both the Avicennian passages are still to come. This assumption is backed by the fact that the collection of Averroistic excerpts in ms. *Laur. Plut. 90 Sup. 64* ends here as well.

Finally, Boggess also remarks upon the presence of clearly marked insertions by the translator in which Hermannus states that he is going to omit a section of Aristotle's work, either because of the difficulty of the passage in the Arabic text, or because of the obscurity of the Greek examples used in it.[14]

1.2. *Literal and Paraphrastic Translation in Hermannus' Statements*

In the prologue to the *Rhetoric*, Hermannus informs us (**a**) that he began working on the translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* because of a request from John, bishop of Burgos, and from the king of Castile; (**b**) that these treatises are significant inasmuch as they complete the *Organon*, like stated by the Arabic commentators; (**c**) that Cicero's and Horace's works are no substitutes for the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics*, since they do not deal with logic but rather with politics and grammar; (**d**) that while translating the Aristotelian treatises he was confronted with many difficulties—namely the obscurity of the Arabic version, the unfamiliar Greek examples it contains, and the scarcity of Arabic scholars prepared to deal with this text; (**e**) that he hopes the readers will forgive the shortcomings of his work until someone will be able to produce a better version with the aid of Greek sources; and (**f**) that in his translation he will not elaborate upon articulations for the text of the *Rhetoric*, because that has already been done by Al-Fārābī, whose *glosa* Hermannus translated.[15] He therefore encourages the

---

12) The first of these citations, discussed in this article, deals with what men regard as good and with rewards for good and bad actions. It is added to the end of Aristotle's chapter I.6. The second citation, beginning in 128ra of the Paris manuscript, analyzes metaphors, periphrasis, diminutives, stylistic coldness, and comparisons. Unlike the previous case, here the Aristotelian text for III.2–4 is completely substituted by Avicenna's words.

13) As I said above, the one exception to this rule is the marginal note on page 77^{r}, which is coupled with a longer Avicennian citation and mistakenly attributed to Avicenna. See section 2.2, 3, and Woerther, "Les citations."

14) See Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus," 243, and see section 3.

15) An edition of this text, the *Didascalia in Rethoricam Aristotilis*, is being prepared by Prof. Aouad and Dr. Woerther at the Paris CNRS.

readers to add such articulations as notes in the margins of their own manuscript, using his al-Fārābī translation as a source.

Hermannus does not openly discuss the method applied in his translation, nor does he state whether his approach to Aristotle's text is going to be literal or paraphrastic. The readers are indeed told that they should not be put off by the *difficultate vel quasi ruditate translationis* (65^{rb}5), and that the following pages are *quod intelligere et excipere potuimus de translatione que pervenit ad nos horum voluminum Aristotilis* (65^{rb}18–21), but one is left to wonder if the defects of the translation here referred to consist in discrepancies between the Arabic and the Latin texts or rather in its dissatisfactory linguistic form and its apparent lack of internal coherence. The wording *difficultate vel quasi ruditate* is rather suggestive of the second option, for, if the translator had decided to depart from his source text, what would be the point of letting the product remain unpolished? The second phrase could be interpreted in the same direction, since it states that Hermannus' understanding of the Arabic *Rhetoric* is imperfect, not that he tried to improve upon it through paraphrastic resources. Still, none of these arguments is decisive.

On the other hand, Hermannus does make an open statement about his method in 77ra15–22, while introducing the first Avicennian citation: this is also the passage in which Hermannus refers explicitly to the fact that he is going to quote an Arabic commentator. Please note that in this case the Avicennian citation is meant to clarify Aristotle's text rather than to substitute for it, like the other Avicennian citation and the Averroistic passages do.

> [**15**] Dixit translator. In hoc passu inveni/mus textum Aristotelis vel ita corruptum, vel decurtatum,/ vel forte in se obscurum quod sententiam plane/ intelligibilem ex eo elicere non potuimus./ Unde visum fuit verbum ex verbo transferre et/ [**20**] post ipsum ad eius elucidationem textum Avi/scenne ex libro suo Asschiphe subiun/gere usque ad finem capituli.

It is a well known fact that the expression *verbum ex verbo transferre* goes back to Cicero's treatise *De optimo genere oratorum*, where, in V.14, the author discusses the method he adopted in rendering Aeschines' and Demosthenes' orations:

> nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi.

As a counterpart to Cicero's position, the reader could look at Boethius' statements about his own translation at p. 135.5–8 of the *Isagoge*:

> Secundus hic arreptae expositionis labor nostrae seriem translationis expediet, in qua quidem uereor ne subierim fidi interpretis culpam, cum uerbum uerbo expressum comparatumque reddiderim. Cuius incepti ratio est quod in his scriptis in

> quibus rerum cognitio quaeritur, non luculentae orationis lepos, sed incorrupta ueritas exprimenda est.

If this is the framework in which Hermannus' words are to be taken, then the opposition established is between literal, stylistically rough translations and translations which are more refined, but less literal. Hermannus' reference to the *difficultate vel quasi ruditate translationis* in his prologue would hint to the fact that his Latin version manages the difficulties of the Arabic text by sacrificing elegance and clarity to literality.

The statement in 77ra19 about wanting to translate the ensuing lines *verbum ex verbo* should not be read in opposition to Hermannus' usual behaviour, but rather as a signal that the customary standard will be adhered to more strictly.

2. Literal and Paraphrastic Translation in Hermannus' Practice

Hermannus' statements about his activity need now to be verified in the light of his practice.

Preliminarily, it should be noted that while translating the first five chapters of Aristotle's treatise, Hermannus consistently renders his source text rather literally, even retaining some expressions which are linguistically awkward in Latin, such as *fa-lam yataḥallaṣū ilā yaḍaʿū lahā ǧuzʾan*, (*they do not reach the point of devoting*[16] *a part to it [i.e. of the art of discourse]*, 1.16), translated as *non contingunt ad hoc, ut partem eius ponerent* (66ra19),[17] or *an yanbaġī an yulaḫḫaṣa … hāḍā t-talḫīṣ* in 2.6–7, whose idiomatical Latin translation would have been something like *that it is advisable to declare … this way*,[18] but which contains an internal accusative, so that Hermannus' very literal rendering is *quoniam determinandus sit hac determinatione* (66^{rb}9–10).

There are also situations in which it is difficult to establish the relationship between Arabic phrases and their Latin rendering, as is the case with some slightly paraphrastic solutions, such as *al-fāḥiṣ* (*the examiner*, 2.11), rendered

---

16) The verb *yaḍaʿū* can be translated as *composing* as well, but here I chose *devoting* because it seems closer to the understanding of the text held by Hermannus. However, I believe that the other option would be more appropriate to the Arabic translation itself, since its Greek source is probably the incidental ὡς εἰπεῖν, wrongly taken to be a completive of the principal verb. It should also be noted that the Arabic text as it is cannot do, since we would expect to see *an* between the preposition *ilā* and the verb *yaḍaʿū*.

17) Here I follow the Toledo manuscript reading (36^{rb}39–40) rather than *non contingunt ad hoc partem eius ponerent* in the Paris manuscript (66ra19).

18) In translating *laḫḫaṣa* as a rightful equivalent of ἀγορεύω (*to declare*, in 1354a22 of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) rather than as *to epitomize*, I follow the position expressed in Gutas, "Aspects of Literary Form," 39 n. 41.

as *scrutatoris vel inquisitoris vel oboratoris* (66^{rb}1–2). Either it is a case of triple translation, in which different options are given for one and the same word, or it shows the insertion in the Latin text of some marginal glosses.[19] Another example is *ru'ya* and *taṭabbut* (*exam* and *confirmation*, 3.1), rendered as *firmitudinem consilii* and *profunditatem investigationis* respectively (66va11–12): this might indeed be a genuine case of paraphrase, since these Latin equivalents are derived from the meaning of the Arabic words taken jointly. However, no instance of non-literal translation goes beyond the borders of a single word or phrase, so that it is usually possible to point out exactly which Arabic expression is translated by each Latin one.[20] Hermannus never tries to reorganize his text at a broader level, so that it can be stated with some confidence that his intention is to offer a literal version of Aristotle.[21]

In the following section I will examine the methods applied by the translator in 77ra15–78va19, where we find the Aristotelian passage Hermannus claims not to understand, the Avicennian citation announced in the translator's insertion, and an Averroistic citation wrongly ascribed to Avicenna.

2.1. *Literal Translation of Aristotle*

It is now possible to check Hermannus' statement that he is going to translate Aristotle's text literally (*verbum ex verbo transferre*) against his own practice. An overall look at the Latin translation and at *Rhetoric* 1363a16–1363b4, in which the list of goods which occupies I.6 is completed, will show us that no large scale transposition takes place, nor any extensive addition or omission. The following lines (77^{rb}14–22) strengthen the idea that Hermannus' approach to Aristotle is indeed literal:

---

19) While *scrutator* and *inquisitor* both reflect the meaning of *fāḥiṣ* in the same way, *oborator* seems to have been selected because of another meaning of the verb *faḥaṣa*, namely *to speak*. This makes it more likely that the alternative between *oborator* and the other solution goes back to the translator himself, while the alternative between *scrutator* and *inquisitor* might derive from Latin glosses.

20) The following cases are even less relevant: *fa-yaṣduqūna* (*and they tell the truth*, 1.8), whose Latin equivalent is given as *et aliqualiter attingunt quod intendunt* (66^{rb}8), maybe because in his Arabic text Hermannus found or read *yaqṣudūna*; *wa-l-'ulamā'* (*the scholars*, 1.14), translated as *communiter* (66ra16), possibly on account of the confusion between the roots *'-l-m* and *'-m-m*; and *wa-huwa ma'lūmun* (*and it is acknowledged*, 2.13), translated as *deinde satis est* (66^{rb}21), where it is easy to attribute the absence of *notum* to some accident within the Latin tradition.

21) In this light, I would not regard double or loose translations of single words as proper examples of paraphrase: rather, I am thinking of the insertion of passages that have no correspondence in the original and of cases of reshaping of the text like those we encounter in section 2.2 (second strategy).

> (**d**) Deinde non faciunt ea que reputantur defectiva etsi sint modica, secundum minus electionis cum exilitate suarum actionum, eo quod ipsa etiam sunt possibilia secundum similitudinem eorum que fiunt faciliter; (**e**) nisi quod modicum factum eorum invenitur aut totaliter aut plurimum aut assimilativum aut defectivum, cum his que exhilarant amicos et contristant inimicos;

The parallel text in Aristotle's Arabic translation is to be found at 32.8–13:

> (**d**) Moreover, [those things] which are regarded as faulty are not destined to be completed, even when their completions are small, [achieved] less deliberately and easily, because they, too, are possible under the same conditions of those things that happen with ease. (**e**) However, their easy completion can be achieved either fully or for the most part, about similar things or about faulty things, like those that please friends and damage enemies.

As he admitted a few lines above, Hermannus does not have a clear idea of the meaning of this passage, but it is easy to trace each comma of the Latin text back to its source in the Arabic original.[22] I also believe that the same degree of literalness can be found in the remaining passages (**b**), (**c**), and (**f-g-h**), even if in these cases some misunderstandings on the translator's part, or maybe some mistakes within the Arabic and Latin manuscript tradition, make the picture less straightforward.

To begin with, in (**b**), at lines 77^{rb}5–6, the following words are to be read: *eo quod reduplicatio vehemens inducit molestiam in prolixitate temporis*, which should be a translation for 32.2–3 of the Arabic *Rhetoric*, where there is *li-anna ṣ-ṣaʿba š-šadīda yuḥaddadu bi-l-ḥuzni fī ṭūli z-zamāni* (*because what is very difficult is defined as pain with regard to the duration of time*). There does not seem to be any semantic relationship between *what is difficult* and *reduplicatio*, whereas the Arabic adjective *šadīd* can actually be translated as *vehemens*. However, rather than interpreting this divergence between Arabic and Latin as a deliberate intervention on Hermannus' part, I would argue that the text read by the translator was *ḍaʿf*, *duplicity*, and not *ṣaʿb*, *difficulty*, since the words are graphically close. Besides, in 78ra6 and in 78ra10 one finds *ḍaʿf* translated as *duplicitas* and one learns why this, rather than *debilitas*, is the best solution.[23]

The problematic spot in (**c**) is located in 77^{rb}11, where the words *in his que sunt ex habundanti* are to be read. This should match the Arabic *wa-āḫirihunna min faḍlin* (*and the last of these things in terms of excellence*, 32.6). Even if *ex habundanti* can very well be interpreted as a translation of *min faḍlin* (since *faḍl* means both *excellence* and *excess*) for what concerns the absence of *and the last of this things* in the Latin text, I think that a suitable solution would be to assume

---

22) The same could be said about (**a**), (**i**), and (**j-k-l**).
23) See subsection 2.2.

that it also was missing in Hermannus' Arabic text. Otherwise, *āḫiri* might have been the only missing word in Hermannus' exemplar, or it might have been overlooked by the translator himself.

Finally, the last difficulty is located in 77^{rb}24–25, i.e. section (**g**).

> (**f**) et miratur de ipsis quando fecerint ea secundum quod sunt in apparatu et experientia. Illi autem (**g**) qui nihil nolunt de malo penitus sunt (**h**) quorum factum reputatur exiguum in correctione et exhortatione ...

The previous lines should reflect the Arabic text of 32.13–15:

> (**f**) and we are surprised at them whenever they make them [i.e. these things] according to what there is in it [i.e. in this situation] in terms of preparation and exercise, and [we are surprised] at that (**h**) whose completion may look easy [**15**] with regard to emendation and exhortation ...

The sentence *qui nihil nolunt de malo* in (**g**) seems to have been added by Hermannus *ex novo*, since there is nothing to explain it within the Arabic text. However, it must be admitted that the syntax of the Arabic here is elliptical, and no translation of (**f-h**) is possible without supplementing a main clause (like *qui nihil nolunt de malo* in Hermannus, or *we are surprised* in my English version) introducing the sentence here translated as *at that whose completion may look easy for what concerns emendation and exhortation*.[24]

2.2. *Paraphrastic Translation of Avicenna*

As I shall show, Hermannus usually approaches Avicenna's text much more freely than his behaviour towards Aristotle would lead us to expect. The translator's goal in dealing with the Arabic philosopher seems to be restricted to the mere elucidation of the text of the Greek *Rhetoric*, so that in some passages the Avicennian treatise ends up being paraphrased or possibly "emended," while in other cases it is still translated in a more or less literal fashion.

Paraphrastic activity concerning Avicenna in Hermannus' text is mainly of two types, since it either consists of explicative insertions in the translated text (first strategy), or of a global rephrasing of an unclear or otherwise unsatisfactory passage (second strategy).

---

[24] A handy solution is to refer back *at that whose completion etc.* to *and we are surprised at them*, in (**f**). It seems that Hermannus mistakenly thought that *at that whose completion may look easy for what concerns emendation and exhortation* was to be taken as a sentence on its own, thus being forced to provide (**g**) in the same capacity in which I have inserted [*we are surprised*] in my translation from Arabic. Therefore, even if the phrase *qui nihil nolunt de malo* rests on false assumption, it is not to be taken as an insertion or as paraphrastic, but rather as an explanation which was indispensable to make the text intelligible.

First strategy: Concerning the first option, it will appear that this method is also employed in the translation of Aristotelian passages. Within the Avicennian passages themselves, no markers introduce the sections inserted by the translator, as it can be observed 78ra9–12:

> (**18**) Etiam intellexerunt quidam eorum pro debilitate duplicitatem, hoc est frequentiam. Et intellectus fuit horum quod, cum aliquid frequenter fit, gravat,[25] quamvis ante hoc fuerit leve.
>
> (**19**) Causa huius diversi intellectus fuit quod per eosdem caracteres in arabico scribitur debilitas et duplicitas.
>
> (**20**) Et exemplum eius in quo nos sumus est quod ducit assensum hominis pro voluntate sua in beneficencia ...

In this passage the reader finds first a doxological statement to the effect that someone has mistaken *duplicitas* (*ḍa'f* in Arabic) for *debilitas* (*ḍi'f* in Arabic) and secondly the reason behind this blunder, namely the homography of our two words in unvowelized Arabic script. Let us then compare this brief passage to its Avicennian counterpart:

> (**18**) And some of them mistook "feebleness" for "double," that is "redoubling." And its meaning is that, whenever anything redoubles, it bores, even if before it used to be simple.
>
> (**20**) And an example—inasmuch as we deal with it—is what causes man's submission towards his preference for benevolence ...

Here there is no trace of what the Latin version tells us about the reason for the confusion between *ḍa'f* and *ḍi'f*. Since it would have been superfluous to inform an Arabic reader that the very words he is reading are composed by the same alphabetical characters, it is quite safe to infer that paragraph (**19**) does not stem from some marginal note in Hermannus' codex or further away in the Arabic manuscript tradition. On the other hand, such an observation obviously requires knowledge of the Arabic language and possibly access to an Arabic text of Avicenna's treatise: there is therefore no reason to suppose it to be a note left by some Latin scholar after the translator had completed his activity. The only option left, then, is to read (**19**) as a paraphrastic comment introduced by the translator himself, even if it is not marked as such.[26] The same

---

25) This should translate the Arabic verb *ammala* (74,7), but it seems likely that Hermannus selected this word in opposition to the following *leve*, which actually mirrors the Arabic *sahlan* (74,7) rather well. The reading *gravat* is to be found in the Paris manuscript (78ra8), while the Toledo manuscript has *generat* (38^{vb}41).

26) The same conclusion concerning the source for the mistake of those criticized by Avicenna is

could be argued for 77^{vb}10–14, or paragraph (**14**), which has no parallel in 74,15–16,[27] or for 129ra26–b2, which does not correspond to 209.9–10 in Avicenna's text.[28]

Similar cases of paraphrastic activity occurring within the Aristotelian text differ inasmuch as the explanatory insertions are usually highlighted by short phrases such as *inquit interpres* in 67va18:

> [**67va5**] Rethorica autem utilis/ est et proficiens eo quod veracia secundum iustum[29] me/liora sunt suis contrariis. Quando etenim non/ fuerint iudicia constituta secundum quod oportet vin/cuntur[30] ab his rebus necessario et istud est res/ [**10**] que meretur redargutionem et increpatio/nem.
>
> **Avenrosdi**: Rethorica duas/ habet utilitates, quarum una est quod in/stigat cives ad operationes nobiles./ Homines enim naturaliter[31] proni sunt ad contrarium o/perationum [**15**] iustitie: quando igitur non reti/nentur per sermones rethoricos vin/cunt eos illicita desideria et operantur/ contraria operibus iusticie.
>
> **Inquit/ interpres**: Idem veritates rerum operan/darum [**20**] pertinentium iusticie sequende sunt et/ respuende falsitates desideriorum illi/citorum. Et ad has veritates conatur/ rethorica et ad redargutiones et/ increpationes[32] [**25**] propter opposita.

According to Hermannus, the Aristotelian passage he is dealing with focuses on the utility of rhetoric, which prompts him to insert Averroes' words on the same subject. As soon as the citation ends, the reader would expect him to revert to Aristotle's text, since this is how he usually behaves. However, before doing so with *deinde eo quod aliquis*, he adds a short statement of his own (*Idem veritates rerum* etc.) in order to clarify the relevance of the insertion from Averroes. The shift from translation to comment is clearly pointed out by the *inquit interpres* phrase.

The absence of an explicit indication that (**14**), (**19**) and 129ra26–b2—all occurring within an Avicennian quotation—are Hermannus' insertions and not

---

reached by Aouad and Rashed in Maroun Aouad and Marwan Rashed, "L'exégèse de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote, première partie," *Medioevo* (1997), 124–127.

27) This addition to Avicenna's text provides the reader with an example of what could be regarded as an adequate or an inadequate reward coming from an orator. One of the reason to believe that this lines where not inserted by a later Latin scribe is that in them we find the rather uncommon expression *citra posse*, meaning *before reaching the (highest) possible level*, which also appears in 78ra25 (*citra meritum*).

28) The goal of this insertion is to enlighten the Latin reader about the expression *dictiones frigidae*.

29) *Secundum iustum* in the Toledo manuscript: the Paris manuscript has *iustis*.

30) The Toledo manuscript reads *vinceretur*.

31) The word *naturaliter* appears both in the Paris and in the Florence manuscript, but it is missing from the Toledo manuscript.

32) Actually, the Paris manuscript reads *et ad redargutiones et increpationes et redargutiones et increpationes*.

translations from some source text should probably alert us to the fact that Hermannus conceived his relationship with Avicenna's text in rather different terms than that with Aristotle's text.

Second strategy: As explained above, Hermannus' interventions on Avicenna's text can also take the shape of an overall rephrasing of a passage which is unclear in its original form or which, as it is, does not help the translator in making Aristotle's intentions easier to understand. In this respect, let us have a look at 77va11–27:

> (**1**) Inquit Avicenna: Deinde de bonis utilibus sive conferentibus est beneficentia vel retributio. (**2**) Etenim in se ipso bonum et conferens in bono altero est commendatio et mentio facta in bonum et dilectio.
>
> (**3**) Et nobilior beneficientia est illa que exhibetur nobilioribus, tuendo ipsos contra malignos eorum inimicorum sive facto sive verbo, (**4**) quemadmodum fecit Homerus poeta quando statuit duos honorabiles, (**5**) scilicet Menelaum regem Athenarum et Achillem fortem, (**7**) et ex eorum opposito posuit alios duos, scilicet Paridem et Helenam (**9**) inimicos ipsorum, et illos erexit in signaculum et quasi titulum laudis, inimicos vero in signum vituperii et depressionis [Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie et Helenam.]

The source passage in Avicenna is 73,7–12:

> (**1**) Besides, among useful goods there are benevolence and reward. (**2**) Indeed, it is useful in itself, while fame, good reputation, and fondness are useful in another good.
>
> (**3**) And the best aspect of benevolence is benevolence towards the best people, with help for them against their base enemies—either practical help or verbal help—(**4**) like what Ūmīrūs [i.e. Homer] the poet did when he chose two excellent people, (**5**) namely Ṯawḏrūs king of Āṯīnīh [i.e. Athens] and Hīlānī [i.e. Helen] his daughter, and he chose Āḫīlūs (i.e. Achilles) the brave, (**6**) and he raised them as a target for praise and applause. (**7**) And in front of them he raised their enemy Iskandar [i.e. Alexander], son of the king of Barbar, (**8**) who was their enemy and therefore handled them roughly with blame and scorn.

The first divergence to be witnessed between our two texts is located in (**5**). Some equivalence is established between Ṯawḏrūs *king of Athens* and father of Helen on one side, and Menelaus *regem Athenarum* on the other one, although we do know that the Homeric Menelaus was king of Sparta and not of Athens. The reason for this far-fetched correspondence is that Hermannus was probably clueless about the identity of Ṯawḏrūs. In his index to the Avicennian treatise, Sālim identifies him with Θησεύς, king and founding hero of Athens. Although Sālim does not state his motives, his solution is probably grounded on the fact that here Avicenna's source is *Rhetoric* 1363a16–1363b4, or, more specifically,

1363a16–19, where it is written that another good thing is *that which someone of the wise or good men or women has preferred, as Athena did with Odysseus, Theseus with Helen, the goddesses with Alexander, and Homer with Achilles* (ὃ τῶν φρονίμων τις ἢ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν προέκρινεν, οἷον ᾽Οδυσσέα ᾽Αθενᾶ καὶ ᾽Αλέξανδρον αἱ θεαὶ καὶ ᾽Αχιλλέα ῎Ομερος). In Avicenna's text Ṯawḏrūs is the only available equivalent for the Greek Theseus and it also occurs conveniently close to Helen and to Athens (which parallels Aristotle's goddess Athena). However, Sālim has overlooked the fact that, in the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*, the name Theseus does not occur at all, since in 31.18–19 it is written *as Homer chose Odysseus the Athenian, Helen, Alexander, and Achilles*. I will return to the subject of Avicenna's intentions in writing Ṯawḏrūs in 4.2, but it is easy to see how Hermannus could not have taken it to refer to Theseus. He probably had as much trouble in identifying him as we do nowadays. This is possibly the reason why he chose to substitute him with the well-known Menelaus, whose relationship with Helen, Achilles, and Alexander is at least clear, neglecting the fact that he was not king of Athens. However, he did not neglect the fact that he never was Helen's father: therefore, the phrase *his daughter* is omitted and the reference to Helen is displaced from (**5**) to (7), while (**6**) does not even appear in the Latin text.

The Latin text for (7), besides including a reference to Helen, is interesting inasmuch as it does not leave the name *Alexander* unaltered, but substitutes it with the form *Paridem*, which is less ambiguous in referring to the Homeric hero. This is especially worth mentioning, since in 77ra27 the same word, namely *al-Iskandar*, occurring in 31.18 of the Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*, is simply transliterated as *Alexander*.

Moreover, in (7) Avicenna describes Alexander as *son of the king of Barbar*, while no such specification is given in the Latin text. The phrase however seems to reappear in (**9**), where we learn about *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie*. The possible substitution of *Troie* for *Barbar* is discussed in 4.2.

Paragraphs (**6**) and (**8**) have no immediate Latin parallel, but they seem to be conflated in (**9**), even if in (**6**) Avicenna's hendiadys *praise and applause* is translated by the single term *laudis* and *signaculum et quasi titulum* is a double translation for *target*. Moreover, Hermannus seems to have mistaken Homer as the subject of *to handle roughly*, while Avicenna intended it to be Alexander/Paris. If the correspondence between (**6**)-(**8**) and (**9**) holds, the phrase *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie* and *Helenam*—almost identical to *scilicet Paridem et Helenam* in (7)—should then be regarded as a gloss.

Still, the most interesting change undergone by Avicenna's text is the removal of Helen from (**5**) and her insertion in (7) alongside with Alexander, so that in Hermannus' section (**5**) there are two objects of praise—namely Menelaus and Achilles—and in (7) there are two objects of blame—namely Paris and Helen,

while in Avicenna's account there were three praiseworthy people—that is Ṭawḏrūs, Helen and Achilles—and only Alexander was to be blamed.

The general result is that in Hermannus' account a neat parallel between two positive characters and two negative ones appears, while Avicenna's original was asymmetrical and somewhat surprising, in as much as the source of praise and blame was first Homer and later on Paris. The shift on Hermannus' part might have been triggered from the fact that in (**4**) Avicenna introduces a dual object for Homer's choice of *two excellent people* to commend (*fāḍilayni* in 73.10), adding Achilles, the third target of appraisal, as the object of a further verb (*wa-aḫtāra* in 73.10), and it could have been facilitated by the fact that Helen is an ambiguous character, which could be deemed worthy both of praise and of despise. However, the convergence of all changes occurring in Hermannus' paraphrase towards a tidier and more foreseeable text should lead us to think that this was the translator's goal as well.

Furthermore, the parallel between two equivalent groups of people, one to be praised and one to be blamed, is easy to retrace in the very citation from Averroes' *Middle Commentary* that Hermannus adds to this passage from Avicenna:[33]

> Inimicum vero et sibi pertinentes deprimit et mala que potuerit exaggregat erga ipsum, prout accidit Homero po/ete cum grecis et inimicis eorum. Grecos enim et magnates eorum et qui ex parte ipsorum erant magnificavit laudibus/ et extulit carminibus durabilibus in sempiternum, alios vero, scilicet ipsorum adversarios, submersit vituperiis que nulla umquam/ [**15**] absterget[34] oblivio in facto proelii quod olim habitum est inter ipsos.

Since Averroes is by far Hermannus' most cited source, there is some ground to believe that it is the basis for the translator's slant on the Avicennian passage cited above. It makes even more sense to think so given that here Averroes does a better job at overcoming the difficulties of the Arabic translation than does Avicenna, as pointed out by Aouad while listing the points of convergence between the two philosophers' commentaries on the *Rhetoric*.[35]

Whenever considering a translation made upon a manuscript text and describing its method, it should be taken into account the fact that any divergence between said version and the source text as it is known from print editions can

---

33) Averroes' Latin text occupies lines 38va16–38 of the Toledo manuscript and the second note on the left margin of 77^{r} of the Paris manuscript. The parallel Arabic text is in 1.6.18–19 of the *Middle Commentary*.

34) In 38va32 the Toledo manuscript shows *absterget*, while the Paris manuscript uses *abtergeret* (at line 15 of the marginal note offering Averroes' text).

35) See Averroes, *Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote. Édition critique du texte arabe et tradution française*, ed. by Maroun Aouad (Paris: Vrin 2002), vol. I (*Introduction générale*), 34–36.

rest either upon the translator's intervention, or upon some variant reading that he found in his manuscript copy. However, here the second option is not really open for us, since the insertion described for Hermannus' first strategy requires knowledge of the Arabic language and attention to the Latin public at the same time, while the example I presented for the second strategy shows so much coherent reorganization of the text that it would be very hard to trace it back to the accidents of manuscript transmission.

2.3. *Literal Treatment of Avicenna*

Other translations of Avicennian passages do however receive a much more literal treatment, a good example being 77^{vb}22–78ra5:

> (**16**) Nam quod queritur vel expectatur in beneficentia est ut perveniatur ad suppremum possibilitatis et quod indulgetur in maleficencia est quod procedit a necessitate et a defectu possibilitatis. (**17**) Quod ergo deficit a possibili in beneficentia est ex impotentia, quod autem pertransit necessitatem in maleficentia est ex proposito. Et quando perdurat molestatio molestantis et intenditur debilitas et metus donec pertranseat horam necessitatis,[36] adducit discordiam procul dubio.

Its Avicennian parallel text is to be found at 74,2–6:

> (**16**) [**74,2**] Because what is expected in terms of benevolence is the realization of possibility, while what is forgiven in terms of harm is what comes from necessity or lack of possibility. (**17**) Hence that which is less than what is possible in terms of benevolence is a deficiency, while that which is more than what is necessary in terms of harm is an intention. And whenever [**5**] submission to misfortunes is prolonged and feebleness and fright are reinforced, so that he exceeds the instant of necessity with harshness, aversion is surely triggered.

The differences between the two texts are not very relevant. In (**16**) there is indeed an example of double translation—namely *queritur vel expectatur* for *al-mutawaqqaʿ* (*what is expected*)—whereas the translation of *bulūġ al-imkān* (*the realization of possibility*) as *ad suppremum possibilitatis* is somewhat interpretative. Moreover, in the same section the manuscripts show the verb *indigetur*, *is needed*, which does not translate the participle *al-maʿḍūr*, *what is forgiven*. The Latin text should however be emended to read *indulgetur*, which is graphically close to *indigetur*, and which fits with the meaning of the following lines.

---

36) The words *et intenditur debilitas et metus donec pertranseat horam necessitatis*, which can be found in the Paris manuscript, are missing in the Toledo manuscript (38^{vb}39).

Further, in (**17**) the expression *molestatio molestantis* is to be found, which looks like an Arabic-sounding etymological figure of speech[37] and which should stand for *al-iḍ'ān li-l-miḥani*, *submission to misfortunes*, but which does not represent its Arabic counterpart very well. Lastly, nothing in the Latin text corresponds to the Arabic words *bi-l-ǧafā'i*, *with harshness*, though the short phrase could simply have been overlooked by the translator. Still, this possible intervention on the text on Hermannus' part is not plausible, since it is both isolated and apparently not designed to improve the sense of the passage in any way.

On the other hand, some expressions are translated very literally, as is the case with *defectu possibilitatis* in (**16**), which verbally reflects Arabic *'awaz imkānin*, *lack of possibility*, but is rather awkward as a Latin expression, while something like *impossibilitate* would be more straightforward. A similar example from (**17**) is *quod ergo deficit a possibili* for *fa-mā qaṣura 'ani l-mumkini*, *that which is less than what is possible*.

3. Occasions and Reasons for Hermannus' Citations from Avicenna

In order to tackle the question of when and why Hermannus employs Avicenna's adaptation of the *Rhetoric* it is useful to review the evidence presented by Boggess about sections of the text that are not translations from the Arabic *Rhetoric*. Boggess starts by making a list of twelve passages taken from Averroes that appear between the beginning of the treatise and folio 76^{rb}.[38] Boggess' detailed analysis of the first insertion (65^{vb}17–66ra3, mirroring Averroes' 1.1.1 and the first lines of 1.1.2) allows us to extend to Averroes our observations about Hermannus' paraphrastic attitude towards Avicenna's text, since it shows that three sections of the Averroistic passage were ignored, as it was the case with Avicenna.[39] One more trace of Hermannus' approach to Averroes' text is to be found in 77ra, where the wrongly attributed citation occurs. At lines 12–13 of the marginal note in which the quotation of the *Middle Commentary* appears, the following words can be read: *inimicum vero et sibi pertinentes deprimit et mala que potuerit ex aggregat erga ipsum, prout accidit Homero po/ete cum grecis et inimicis eorum*. To begin with, the correspondence between the first line and its source is not completely straightforward, since Averroes says *yaf'alu bi-'aduwwin ḏālika l-insānu š-šarra*

---

37) *Molestatio molestantis* seems to be a literal rendering of an expression like *al-iḍ'ān li-l-muḍ'aniyy*, whose normal translation would be *molestatio alicuius*.

38) See Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus," 240–242.

39) According to Aouad's edition, the neglected parts are *iḏ kānat hātāni ṣ- ṣinā'atāni* (1.1.1,2–3), *wa-lakin min ǧihati ... wa-hiya ṣinā'atu l-manṭiqi* (1.1.1,9–13), and *wa-muntahiyan minhā ilā miqdārin mā ... bi-hāḏihi ṣ-ṣinā'ati* (2.1.1,2–4).

wa-bi-aṣdiqā'ihi l-ḫayra, namely *and that man does what is bad to an enemy and what is good to a friend*. Moreover, in Aouad's edition nothing could explain the presence of *poete*, the Latin attribute for Homer. However, the phrase *Ūmīrūš aš-šā'ir* is to be found in the previous paragraph (1.16.17).

Boggess also names two passages taken from Avicenna: one (77va11–78va19) is the text I have discussed in the previous sections, while the other (128ra17–130^{rb}28) concerns figurative speech. The few lines added by Hermannus to both citations testify that his aim was quite different in each case: at 77ra15–22 the translator states that the Arabic text is so hard to understand that he is forced to transpose it word by word and to add Avicenna's text *ad eius elucidationem*, while in 128ra11–16 one reads:

> in hoc passu tot inciderunt *exempla extranea* et *grata*[40] *vocabula* quod nullum nobis consilium fuit prosequendi textum Aristotilis. Unde coacti fuerimus[41] sequi illud quod Avicenna de hoc passu excerpserat et posuerat in libro suo Aschiphe.

Accordingly, in this case Avicenna's text is not used as a commentary, in order to enlighten a difficult passage, but rather as a substitute for Aristotle, a section of whose text (1405a31–1407a18) is not translated.

As Boggess points out, there are four more occasions in which Hermannus apologizes for omitting a part of the original *Rhetoric*, always on account of the obscurity of the Greek examples.[42] It might be worth noting that both the reason for the insertion of the first Avicennian passage—namely the damaged state and the intrinsic difficulty of the text—and that for the insertion of the second Avicennian passage—that is, the strange examples—are already named in Hermannus' prologue.[43]

---

40) It is hard to see how *grata* should be translated, but the best solution would probably be *pleasant*, to be understood as *refined* and therefore hard to understand. However, another option seems easier: namely, *grata* could be a mistake for *greca*, which is graphically close. Both our witnesses read *grata*, but *greca* fits with what the translator states in his prologue, in 65^{rb}4–13: *Nec miretur quisquam vel indi/gnetur de difficultate vel quasi rudita/te translationis, nam multo difficilius/ et rudius ex greco in arabicum est transla/ta. Ita quod Alfarabius, qui primus conatus/ est ex rethorica aliquem intellectum/ glosando elicere, multa exempla greca/ propter ipsorum obscuritatem pertransiens dere/linquit et propter eandem causam multa du/bie exposuit*. Both in the prologue and while introducing his second quotation from Avicenna, Hermannus cites both the low quality of the Arabic text and the Greek words present in it as the main difficulties in dealing with the *Rhetoric*.

41) Boggess seems to be right in preferring *fuimus*, which is in the Toledo manuscript.

42) The passages named by Boggess are 92^{vb}12–18, 134va24–28, 135va24–b7, and 143ra18–20: see Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus," 243.

43) See, for example, 65^{rb}6–8 (*multo difficilius et rudius ex greco in arabico est translata*) and 65^{rb}10–13 (*Alfarabius ... multa exempla greca propter ipsorum obscuritatem pertransiet derelinquit et propter eadem causam multa dubie exposuit*).

The overall picture shows us Hermannus using Averroes as a source for explanatory notes in the first chapters of the *Rhetoric* and skipping some passages, or substituting them with Avicenna, in the later, more example-intensive books. As can be evinced from the prologue and from Boggess' contribution, al-Fārābī also provided both some interesting readings and a general framework for the translation.

This approach seems quite sensible, if one looks at the fact that Averroes' work on the *Rhetoric* is explicitely structured as a commentary, aimed at making Aristotle's text easier to grasp, and is divided into Aristotelian entries and their explanation, while Avicenna's treatise, as a part of the *Book of the Cure*, looks like as a self-sufficient text. As a reworking of the original, it can very well substitute it, as it actually happens in the Arabic philosophical tradition after Avicenna.

Therefore, the first quotation from the *Book of Cure* seems to be somehow exceptional, since it encompasses a citation from Avicenna, one from Averroes, and the original Aristotelian text. It might be that Aristotle's text was not omitted because in this case Hermannus had no problem with his examples, but rather with the general sense of the passage, since this is what he states while introducing the citation. Besides, this could serve as a motive for the insertion of the note from Averroes. Still, by looking at the subjects addressed concomitantly by Avicenna and Averroes, it emerges that the only relevant passages are those about Homer as someone who knew how to remunerate both friends and enemies through the rhetorical devices of praise and blame. On the one hand, this passage seems to deserve particular attention inasmuch as it offers a specifically rhetorical way in which gratitude should be expressed. On the other hand, Hermannus must have found the Homeric example both puzzling and interesting, so that Averroes' passage, which gives little information about historical details, did not seem enough to clarify, it and Avicenna's words had to be added. The idea that in his first citation from the *Book of the Cure* Hermannus was chiefly concerned with Avicenna's words about Homer is strengthened by the fact that, as shown in 2.2, these are the lines on which the translator acts most intrusively.

4. Hermannus As a Witness for Aristotle and for Avicenna

Since Hermannus constantly endeavours to keep his Latin translation close to its Arabic source, it appears that his work on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* deserves a critical and reliable edition, which could then be compared to the Greek-Arabic translation of the *Rhetoric*. This comparison would provide a good basis to ameliorate the Arabic text, which in turn is a relevant witness for the Greek original of the Arabic *Rhetoric*. This path of research looks promising if one takes

into account the fact that, on one hand, we only have one direct witness of the Arabic *Rhetoric*—namely the ms. *Parisinus Ar. 2346*—and that none of the editors[44] of the Arabic version use Hermannus systematically, and that, on the other hand, the Latin version seems to be based upon an edition of the Arabic text which does not fully overlap with that in ms. *Parisinus Ar. 2346*, since Hermannus' translation does not include chapters 15, 16 and 17 of Aristotle's second book.[45]

The question of how and whether Hermannus' translation could help us in establishing Avicenna's text is harder to answer. Even if we had a stemma and a reliable text of the Latin *Rhetoric*, we would still have to face the fact that various passages of Avicenna's treatise are paraphrased rather than translated, and that even those sections which actually are translated are treated less literally than Aristotle's text. However, since the passages translated from the *Book of the Cure* are not too long, it seems possible to analyze them satisfactorily in order to distinguish the paraphrastic sections from the literal ones, so that the latter can receive more weight as full-fledged witnesses. Moreover, a more precise understanding of Hermannus' goals in quoting and rephrasing Arabic commentators could enable us to better use the Latin text as a secondary witness, in the way commentaries are normally employed in order to establish the wording of the text commented upon. This does of course mean that any information extracted from Hermannus' work should be examined and utilized with as much caution as possible.

In the following section I examine a passage in which a solution to textual problems could actually come from the Latin translation (4.1) and cases in which the latter has only a lesser role (4.2).

4.1. *Aut per naturam suam*

In 75,4–9 Avicenna discusses non-monetary rewards, such as happiness for friends and unhappiness for enemies. Then it is stated that everyone admires and is impressed by something that fits him. Finally, in 75,8–9 Avicenna seems to say that, if this happened on the ground of custom and habit, people would admire things by which they would be unimpressed unless they had grown used to them.

---

44) See Aristotle, *Rhetorica in versione arabica vetusta*, ed. by ʿAbdurraḥmān Badawī (Cairo: Maktabat an-Nahḍa al-Miṣrīya, 1959).

45) See Averroes, *Commentaire moyen*, vol. I (*Introduction générale*), 9, and Frédérique Woerther, "Le rôle des traductions dans les traditions textuelles: les versions arabe et arabo-latine de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote," *Actes du colloque de la FR 33*, ed. by D. Smith (Paris: Vrin, Textes et Traditions, forthcoming).

> (**28**) And everyone enjoys something and admires something that is fit for him, since preparation occasionally makes something pleasant and admirable, in such a way that, if it were not for it, one would not enjoy or admire it.[46]

However, the text printed by Sālim and translated above is unlikely to be the original one, since the period in 75,8 begins with the expression *wa-immā … wa* which cannot be interpreted as a coordinative conjunction, because for that the reading *wa-immā … aw* would be required. Nor can *immā* really be taken as I did in my translation, because if *immā* actually were the composition of *in* and *mā* it would have to be followed by a verbal phrase.

A possible and rather inexpensive solution would be to ignore Sālim's punctuation and relate the *wa-immā bi-ḥasabi mā* of line 8 with *bi-ḥasabi mā* of line 6, so that the translation of the passage at lines 5–9 would be *and unlike those things, either about what happens to him in accordance with observation concerning him …—and everyone enjoys something and admires something that is fit for him—or about what preparation occasionally makes pleasant and admirable …* However, in order to accept this hypotheses, it would be preferable to see the conjunction *immā* before the *bi-ḥasabi mā* expression at line 6.

Otherwise, we might emendate *wa-immā … wa* in *wa-immā … aw*, introducing a disjunction instead of a conjunction, or we could opt for *wa-ammā bi-ḥasabi mā iʿtādahu wa-tadarraba fīhi, fa-inna* …, where the initial *amma* would be answered by the *fa* in *fa-inna*.

Yet, Hermannus' text suggests another solution, since in 78^{rb}28-va6 it reads

> (**28**) Omnis enim homo delectatur in aliquo et ammiratur de aliquo quod sibi placet apropriato ei, aut per naturam suam aut per assuetudinem aut per experientiam ipsius. Multa enim delectant et placent propter experientiam que si non esset experientia non delectarent nec placerent.

The Latin *aut per naturam suam* does not have any parallel within the Arabic text and *aut per assuetudinem aut per experientiam ipsius*, translation of *wa-immā bi-ḥasabi mā iʿtādahu wa-tadarraba fīhi* (literally, *about what one is prepared for and used to)*, is annexed to the previous and not to the following sentence. If this were a faithful image of its source, the Arabic text would be *fa-kullun yaltaḏḏu bi-šayʾin wa-yataʿaǧǧabu min šayʾin yaḥusṣuhu, immā bi-ḥasabi fiṭratihi, wa-immā bi-ḥasabi mā iʿtādahu wa-tadarraba fīhi*, *and everyone enjoys something and admires something that is proper for him, either about his own nature, or about what one is prepared for and used to*. I suggest the use of the word *fiṭra* because it

---

[46] The Arabic text for this section (75,7–9) is the following: *fa-kullun yaltaḏḏu bi-šayʾin wa-yataʿaǧǧabu min šayʾin yaḥusṣuhu. Wa-immā bi-ḥasabi mā iʿtādahu wa-tadarraba fīhi, fa-inna d-durbata qad tulaḏḏiḏu šayʾan wa-tuʿaǧǧibu minhu, law lāhā lam yultaḏḏ bihi wa-lā tuʿaǧǧab minhu*.

also appears in 75,8, where it is translated by the same Latin equivalent *natura* (78^{rb}29),[47] but, in order to solve the problem with the Avicennian text outlined above, any Arabic word of the same meaning would be satisfactory.

The insertion of *about his nature* would have the advantage of fixing Avicenna's text on the basis of one of its witnesses, namely the Latin translation. Moreover, in this light the reading of the Arabic manuscripts can easily be explained as the product of a jump from same to same, that is to say from *immā* to *immā*. Adding *natura* to the list of reasons to like something also helps us to understand the words *multa enim delectant et placent propter experientiam que si non esset experientia non delectarent nec placerent* in 78va5–6, because now there is an opposition between a situation in which only nature influences us and a situation in which it acts alongside with habit.

On the other hand, a mistake between *aw* and *wa* or *imma* and *amma* would be easy to explain as well. Besides, while translating Avicenna, Hermannus does sometimes add short sections without announcing them,[48] so that we should not be overly surprised by the fact that Hermannus' *aut per naturam suam* has no parallel in the Arabic text. Still, this addition would have an—however small—doctrinal relevance, which is not the case with any of the examples discussed in the previous sections. It could also be said that *natura* might stem from the already named 78^{rb}28 passage, which says *prout appropriatur ei eorum secundum suam naturam*, but since there nature is not set against any kind of experience, that would have to be traced back to a mechanical mistake, which does not seem very likely. Not only does the tripartition *natura*/*assuetudo*/*experientia* not appear in 75,8/78^{rb}28, but it also is not to be found in the previous chapters of the Aristotelian treatise. Even the somewhat similar passage from the very beginning of the *Rhetoric*, *and some people do these things* (i.e. rhetoric and dialectic) *without a plan, while other people do them through familiarity stemming from habit* (οἱ μὲν εἰκῇ ταῦτα δρῶσιν, οἱ δὲ διὰ συνήθειαν ἀπὸ ἕξεως), is translated by Hermannus as *quidam ergo vulgarium faciunt hec inperspecte, alii vero ex assuetudine et habitu stabilito* (66ra9–10). The only word this Latin passage shares with 78va2 is *assuetudine*.

One last objection that could be raised is that the emendation based on Hermannus' text would make Avicennas' *i'tād* (*assuetudo*) and *tadarrub* (*experientia*) synonymous, but, from what can be gleaned from the Arabic-Latin lexica to

---

47) The Arabic *fiṭra* is also translated as *natura* in Avicenna's *Philosophia Prima*, while *al-'aql al-maftūr* is translated by *naturalis intellectus* in *De generatione et corruptione*. See Avicenna, *Liber de philosophia prima vel scientia divina*, ed. by Simone Van Riet, Gérard Verbeke (Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill 1977–1983), *lexiques*, and Avicenna, *Liber tertium naturalium de generatione et corruptione*, ed. by Simone Van Riet, Gérard Verbeke (Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1987).

48) See section 2.2.

Avicenna's works, none of these couples of terms is very common or very technical, so that it does not seem impossible that they could be used to mean the same thing.

In conclusion, I think that in a passage such as (**28**), which does not otherwise seem to engage in paraphrase, Hermannus is a trusty enough witness to actually consider ameliorating the Arabic text on his basis.

4.2. *Other Problems*

As pointed out in section 3, in 73.7–13 Avicenna discusses benevolence, of which the best kind is benevolence towards the best sort of people. Avicenna cites Homer as an example of the best kind of verbal benevolence, since on the one side he praises the king of Athens, Helen, and Achilles—all excellent people and Homer's friends—and on the other side he contrasts them to Alexander, their enemy, who in turn blamed and insulted them. This amounts to dealing properly with enemies and friends. More precisely, in 73,11–12 he speaks of

> (**7**) ... Alexander, son of the king of Barbar, (**8**) who was their enemy and therefore handled them roughly with blame and scorn

In section 2.2, where the whole passage is discussed, I came to the conclusion that the translation of this paragraph is remarkably paraphrastic. Moreover, the phrase *Iskandar bin malikin barbarin*, *Alexander, son of the king of Barbar*, seems to have two Latin renderings: a synthetic one in (**7**), that is *scilicet Paridem* (77va23), and one in paragraph (**9**), which has no parallel in the Arabic text, that is *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie* (77va27). In these two loci Paris is always coupled with Helen, as already discussed in section 2.2. Before discussing Avicenna's text, it is necessary to consider the relationship between the attributes *son of the king of Barbar* and *filium regis Troie*.

Actually, the superfluous repetition of the content *that is to say, Paris and Helen* in (**7**) and (**9**) and the awkward syntactical position of the second *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie et Helenam* must bring the reader to believe that one of the *scilicet* clauses, and the second one with more likelihood, is not Hermannus' translation, but a later gloss, which was meant to clarify the expression *inimicos*, but which was mistakenly inserted in the main text. If *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie et Helenam* is a gloss, then Hermannus did not translate Avicenna's *son of the king of Barbar* at all. The closeness between *son of the king of Barbar* and *filium regis Troie*, which is both semantic and formal, could make us doubt that the Latin text actually bears no relation to the Arabic one, but it must be admitted that to any Latin reader *filium regis Troie* would be a perfectly natural attribute to gloss the name Paris, so that its presence does not need any further explanation.

Going back to the Arabic textual problems, something needs to be said about the Arabic *Barbar* (برير). Avicenna's manuscripts do not agree about this reading: according to Sālim's apparatus, the printed reading appears in mss. *Al-Azhar Baḥīt 331 falsafa*, *Sūhāǧ 39 manṭiq*,[49] *New Dāmād*, *India Office*,[50] *British Museum Or. 7500*, *Dār al-kutub 894 falsafa*, and *Dār al-kutub 262 ḥikma wa-falsafa*, while the ms. *Süleymaniye*[51] has *barmar* (برمر) and the ms. *Nuruosmaniye* has *būbar* (بوبر). The Leiden mss. *Or. 4 Golius* and *Or. 84 Golius* both show the word *barbar* (بربر), unpointed or only partially pointed at 153^{v}36 and at 279^{r}16 respectively. Sālim's reading is the only one that makes any sense at all, but the other options could point at some difficulty within the Arabic manuscript transmission.

The exact meaning of *malik barbar* is also not so easy to pin down.[52] Ullmann[53] lists *al-barbariyyūna* as a possible translation for βάρβαρος, while GaLex[54] provides *al-barbar* as a rendering for both οἱ βάρβαροι and βαρβαρικός and *al-umum wa-barābira* as a translation for βάρβαροι. Avicenna's *Iskandar bin malikin barbarin* could then be taken to mean *Alexander, son of a foreign king*, a description which would exactly suit Paris son of Priam, quite at home in the group of Homeric characters. In view of the fact that Hermannus actually took this passage to refer to Paris, if he did find the word *barbar* in his source, he must have understood it as *foreign*. However, since the only lexicographical evidence for this

---

49) From Sālim's presentation of his manuscripts we learn that this fragment used to belong to Ḥasan al-ʿAṭṭār, shaykh of al-Azhar. See Avicenna, *Ibn Sīnā, Al-šifā', la logique, VIII, Rhétorique (Al-ḫaṭābah)*, ed. By Muhammad S. Sālim (Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale 1954).

50) The source of my information is again Sālim's preface. It is not clear which manuscript is intended here; at present the *India Office* manuscripts seem to be part of the British Museum collection.

51) Here too I derive my information from Sālim. I am not sure about which manuscript is referred to here, but two possible candidates are *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Dāmād Ibrahim Paşa 822* and *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Dāmād Ibrahim Paşa 823*, since, according to Bertolacci's list of witnesses for Avicenna's *Ilāhiyyāt*, they both contain the logical section of the *Kitāb aš-Šifā'*. See Amos Bertolacci, "On the Manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Shifā'*," in *Islamic Thought in the Middle Ages: Studies in Text, Transmission and Translation in Honour of Hans Daiber*, ed. by Anna Akasoy and Wim Raven (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 59–76.

52) Kazimirski does not list *barbar* as an adjective and translates *al-barbar* as *the Berbers*, while Wehr and Traini offer the adjective *barbariyy*, again rendered as *Berber*, and Lane as well translates the substantive *barbar* as *the Berbers*, even if he does point out that the word is in an etymological relationship with the Greek βάρβαροι. Still, it is hard to understand who this *Alexander son of a Berber king* could be or, more to the point, why a Berber should have been inserted in a list of Homeric characters at all.

53) See Manfred Ullmann, *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2002).

54) See Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas, *A Greek and Arabic lexicon (GALex): materials for a dictionary of the mediaeval translations from Greek into Arabic* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

value is to be found in Greek-Arabic translations, it is far from certain whether Avicenna could have employed *barbar* in that sense. Surely he did not find it in the Arabic version of the *Rhetoric*, where βάρβαρος in 1410[a]15 is translated as *iğnabiyy* at 197.11 and τὰ βαρβαρικὰ in 1361a36 is omitted at 25.14.[55] Still, it looks like all the possible interpretations for *Iskandar bin malikin barbarin* force us to come to terms with some difficulty.

In this light, by taking Hermannus' *Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie* as a translation rather than as a gloss, one could think that Hermannus decided to improve upon his source text, specifying that Alexander was Trojan and not a generic stranger. This would fit well with the paraphrastic nature of our section, as is the substitution of the name Paris for the synonymous but more generic Alexander.

Another option worth considering would be that Hermannus did actually translate the text he found in his manuscript, but that this text was not *Iskandar bin malikin barbarin* (اسكندر بن ملك بربر). Rather, it might have been *Iskandar bin malikin Truyā*, where *Truyā* (تريى) would be a somewhat odd transliteration for the toponym Troy, whose modern standard version is the French loanword *Ṭirwāda*.[56] In itself, emending Avicenna's text to mean *Alexander, son of the king of Troy* should be possible on a merely semantic basis, but I think that, without the support of the Latin version, the chances of Troy being known to Avicenna as *Truyā*, rather than as some transliteration of Ilium, are quite small.

As a conclusion, the relevant questions for this passage are (**i**) whether Hermannus' phrase *filium regis Troie* is to be read as an easy gloss or as a literal translation of the Arabic text, and (**ii**) whether it is closer to Avicenna's linguistic usage

---

55) Averroes' *Middle Commentary* to the Aristotelian treatise does contain the word *al-barbar*, namely in 2.4.27, where the interpreted Greek passage is 1382a4–7, a section of the second book in which Aristotle distinguishes between anger, which always targets individuals, and hate, which can have groups as an object as well. Averroes suggests *al-barbar* as an example of hated group: nevertheless, Aouad cautions that here *al-barbar* does not designate nonspecific strangers, but rather the Berber people as a whole, with reference to the thirteenth century Iberian demography. Then again, Avicenna did not live in thirteenth century Andalusia, so maybe his usage of *barbar* is closer to what we find in Greek-Arabic translations than to any reference to a specific historic population. See Averroes, *Commentaire moyen*, vol. III (*Commentaire du Commentaire*), 248–249.

56) What we would expect as a transliteration of Τροία is something like *Iṭrūyā* or *Ṭirūyā* with long vowels, with emphatic *ṭ* and with no more than a single consonant at its beginning. Still, Vagelpohl's observations about transliteration standards in the Arabic *Rhetoric* and in other early Greek-Arabic translations show us that at this stage a form like *Truyā* would not have been unconceivable: examples are given for the initial consonant cluster, since the name Πλάτων can be transliterated as *Aflāṭūn*, as *Flāṭūn*, and as *Flaṭūn*, and for unemphatic *t* instead of *ṭ*, since the name Τήλεφος can be transliterated as *Tīlāfūs*. This, however, is not enough to grant us that the transliteration *Truyā* would have been possible for Avicenna, who surely did not find it in his translation of Aristotle, who in the *Rhetoric* does not use the word Τροία at all. See Uwe Vagelpohl, *Aristotle's* Rhetoric *in the East* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008), 150–159.

to employ the word *barbar* in order to mean *foreign* or rather to employ the transliteration *Truyā* to refer to Troy. At the present stage of research, I do not believe that these questions can receive satisfactory answers, and surely not on account of Hermannus' translation.

Transliteration options for Greek names available to Avicenna and Hermannus' paraphrastic approach to Arabic commentators are relevant elements in the discussion of the identity of Ṭawḏrūs at 73,10 of Avicenna's text as well, although neither in this case the source of the solution I suggest is Hermannus himself.

Theodore is the Greek name which comes closest to our Ṭawḏrūs; as we know, however, no Theodore is involved in the war for Troy or is related to Helen. Besides, it should be noted that different manuscripts have different readings for this passage: in *Al-Azhar Baḥīt 331 falsafa*, *Nuruosmaniye* and *Süleymaniye* there is the reading chosen by Sālim, in *Sūhāǧ 39 manṭiq* there is *bādūs*, in *New Dāmād* there is باودروس, in *Dār al-kutub 894 falsafa* there is *māwḏrūs* and *tāḏrūs*, while in the *India Office* manuscript and in *British Museum Or. 7500* there is *tāḏrūs*.

Since the mention of *Helen his daughter* follows immediately, it is possible that here Avicenna is actually referring to Tyndareus, father to Helen, Clytemnestra and the Dioscuri. Catalogues of alternate names for prominent writers such as Theodor Abū Qurra report him both as Ṭawḏrūs and as Tandūrus,[57] which comes quite close to a transliteration of Tyndareus.[58] Besides, there are not many reasons why this character should have been well known to Arabic readers: therefore, it is not unconceivable that his name could not have been told apart from Theodor. Unfortunately, the Greek name Τυνδάρεως does not appear in Ullmann's *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts*,[59] nor in the Greek-Arabic index of the GaLex first volume. Kraemer's article on Homer's Arabic reception does not give us any clue in this direction either[60] and in Aouad and Rashed's list of sources for references to ancient

---

57) See for example the on-line thesaurus of the Consortium of the European Research Libraries, which lists the ways in which various place and people names appeared in European press between 1450 and 1830. Cf. *Consortium of the European Research Library*, http://thesaurus.cerl.org/record/cnp00405030, accessed April 10, 2012.

58) Varying spellings for the same name can be found in Ibn an-Nadīm's *Fihrist* as well: Flügel's edition has *Tayādūrs* (12.4, 14.20, 303.16–18), *Ṭayādūrs* (24.5, 249.6), *Ṭayūdūrs* (269.5), *Tayadrūs* (242.17), *Taḏārī* (244.9) and *Taḏrus* (244.11). In the translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* we only find two occasions in which the rendering of the Greek θεόδωρος is still extant: in 106.9 (i.e. 1400b16) we read *Ṭādūrūs*, while in 176.3 (i.e. 1404b22) we find *Ṭāwadūrūs*.

59) See Ullmann, *Wörterbuch*.

60) Jörg Kraemer, "Arabische Homerverse," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 106 (1956). As M. Aouad has kindly suggested, a fruitful line of enquiry on this problem could entail going through the texts of the Arabic historians most concerned with Greek subjects looking for references to the mythological Tyndareus.

exegetic activity on the *Rhetoric* (in Greek or in Arabic) there is no author likely to have shown much interest for this sort of erudite detail.[61]

Otherwise, one might imagine some paleographical mistake leading from a regular transliteration of Τυνδάρεως such as *Ṭindarūs* to what is to be found in the manuscripts; the only problem with this interpretation is that in our Arabic version of the *Rhetoric* there is no reference to the original Theseus or to any relation of Helen that could be mistaken for Tyndareus.

So, either one assumes that Avicenna could access another translation of the *Rhetoric*, in which Theseus—or maybe even Tyndareus—was named,[62] or one takes Ṭawḏrūs to somehow go back to *Undūsūs al-Aṭīnī*, who is mentioned in 31.18 of Lyons's edition.

4.3. *Conclusions*

Accepting any reading from the Latin translation over the testimony of the Arabic manuscripts for Avicenna's text implies the assumption that all the Arabic witnesses share a common ancestor which, on the other hand, does not belong to the group of Hermannus' predecessors. This holds true for the problem discussed in section 4.1, since all the Arabic codices show the very same text. The only other possibility is to regard all the Arabic readings as polygenetic errors: actually, at least the omission of the Arabic equivalent of *aut per naturam suam* is potentially polygenetic, as it would be the result of a jump from like to like, namely from *immā* to *immā*. Still, the idea that the same mistake was repeated in every single case does not sound very likely. The possibility that, while all the Arabic manuscripts are related to each other, the Latin translation stands alone surely needs further corroboration in order to become fully acceptable, but it is less unlikely than it does appear at first sight, since the most ancient witnesses of Hermannus are coeval with the most ancient dated Arabic manuscripts for the logical part of the *Kitāb aš-Šifā'*, for what can be gained from Bertolacci's provisional list of witnesses for the *Ilāhiyyāt*.[63] Moreover, witnesses of Hermannus seem to be slightly older than all of the manuscripts used by Sālim.[64]

---

61) See Aouad and Rashed, "L'exégèse de la *Rhétorique*."

62) We do not have the text of any other translation, but we know of their existence through Ibn an-Nadīm's catalogue; all the relevant information about them is to be found in Aouad, "La *Rhétorique*," and in Francis E. Peters, *Aristoteles Arabus: the Oriental Translations and Commentaries on the Aristotelian Corpus* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).

63) Manuscripts of the *Logic* that, as the Paris and Toledo manuscripts, go back to the XIII century are *Nuruosmaniye Kütüphanesi 2710* (1267), *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya 2442* (1272), *al-Azhar Baḥīt 331 falsafa* (1285, used by Sālim as well), *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi Carullah 1424* (693H/1293), *Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi Dāmād Ibrahim Paşa 823* (1297). See Bertolacci, "On the Manuscripts," 59–76.

64) See Avicenna, *Ibn Sīnā, la logique, VIII*, 24–30, Ed. by Muhammad S. Sālim, and Georges Anawati, *Avicenne: la Métaphysique du Shifa'* (Paris: Vrin 1978), 18–20.

5. Appendix

In the following pages I add Hermannus' translation for the Arabic version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 31.16–32.22 and for *Kitāb al-Ḫiṭāba* 73,7–75,15 based both on the Paris and the Toledo manuscript. This is followed by my own English translation of Hermannus' two Arabic sources. These three texts are also broken down into short numbered sections, so that each section of the Latin version mirrors one section of Aristotle's or Avicenna's text, in the hope that this division will make the comparison between source and translation easier. Alphabetic characters from (**a**) to (**l**) are used for the Arabic version of the Aristotelian text and its Latin translation, while Arabic numbers in round brackets from (**1**) to (**31**) are reserved for Avicenna's text and its Latin rendering. On the other hand, Arabic numbers in square brackets refer to page and line numbers in the Paris manuscript and in Lyons' and Sālim's editions.

As the following pages will show, our witnesses share some remarkable mistakes, which enable us to establish their dependence on an archetype. It is however not possible to state that any of them is a descendant of the other one: accordingly, both of them will have to be taken into account when choosing what to print.[65]

I wish to highlight that my version of the Latin text is, by all points of view, provisional, since no reconstruction of the manuscript transmission of Hermannus' translation is available nowadays; my only goal is to provide the reader with a meaningful text and with information about what our witnesses offer. Accordingly, I specify in the footnotes whenever the Paris and Toledo manuscripts have different readings.

5.1. *Hermannus' version of 31.16–32.22 of the Arabic version of Aristotle's* Rhetoric *and of 73,7–75,15 of Avicenna's* Kitāb al-Ḫiṭāba[66]

(**a**) **Inquit Aristotelis**: Deinde qui antecedit et eligit hominem ex intelligentibus aut ex bonis, ex viris aut feminis,[67] quemadmodum elegit Homerus Orosium atheniensem et Helenam et Alexandrum et Achillem; (**b**) et universaliter[68] cum ipse elegit ut faceret cum amicis et inimicis hoc quod eis pertinebat, scilicet

---

65) Similar conclusions about the independence of the Paris and the Toledo manuscripts are reached in Woerther, "Les citations."

66) This text can be found in 77ra24–78va15 of the Paris manuscript and in 38va9–38vc16 of the Toledo manuscripts.

67) In the Toledo manuscript we find *aut ex feminis*.

68) Hermannus translates *al-ğumlata* (31.20) as later on (in 78^{rb}4) he will translate the commoner *bi-l-ğumlati*, used by Avicenna in 74.14.

malum cum inimicis et bonum cum amicis, sicut sunt possibilia que facta sunt et que fiunt faciliter propter timorem sine[69] molestia in hora exigua, eo quod reduplicatio vehemens inducit molestiam in prolixitate temporis.

(**c**) Et si fuerit[70] secundum quod volunt: tunc[71] hoc quod volunt est ac si nihil velint de malo penitus, aut hoc quod est minus de hoc bono. Et hoc est quando erratur in retributione, aut in exiguis, aut in propriis aut in his que sunt ex habundanti. Non enim fit istud per hunc modum sed per hoc quod configuratur; fit enim per[72] ea que sunt propinqua in genere et in[73] potentia.

(**d**) Deinde non faciunt ea que reputantur defectiva etsi sint modica secundum minus electionis cum exilitate suarum actionum, eo quod ipsa etiam sunt possibilia secundum similitudinem eorum que fiunt faciliter, (**e**) nisi quod modicum factum eorum invenitur aut totaliter aut plurimum aut assimilativum aut defectivum, cum his que exhilarant amicos et contristant inimicos; (**f**) et miratur de ipsis quando fecerint[74] ea[75] secundum quod[76] sunt in apparatu et experientia. Illi autem (**g**) qui nihil nolunt de malo penitus sunt (**h**) quorum factum reputatur exiguum in correctione et exhortatione. Deinde de hoc quoque[77] laudatur cum incremento: est cum accipitur quid cum desideratur et petitur; et reputatur etiam[78] non solum delectabile, sed et honestum.

(**i**) Et hoc in unoquoque hominum secundum modum rei quam petit et preoptat: apud amatores quidem victorie ut contingat eis victoria, apud autem amatores honoris ut contingat eis honor et apud amatores pecunie ut assequantur pecuniam.

(**j**) Et hoc modo in ceteris maneriebus (**k**) sive in bono sive in utili. (**l**) Ex his ergo modis accepimus inductiva credulitatum.

(**1**) **Inquit Avicenna**: Deinde de bonis utilibus sive conferentibus est benficentia vel retributio. (**2**) Etenim in se ipso bonum et conferens in bono altero est commendatio et mentio facta in bonum et dilectio.

---

69) The Toledo manuscript has *sive molestiam*.
70) The Paris manuscript seems to read *fiunt*.
71) The Paris manuscript reads *tum*.
72) Here the Toledo manuscript has *sed per hoc quod configuratur; fit enim per hoc quod configuratur ea que sunt propinqua*, where the second *configuratur* has been expunged.
73) The second *in* is missing from the Toledo manuscript.
74) The Toledo manuscript has *fecerunt*.
75) *Ea et secundum* in the Toledo manuscript.
76) The Toledo manuscript has *que*.
77) *Quoque de hoc* in the Paris manuscript.
78) The Toledo manuscript has *etiam et non*.

(**3**) Et nobilior[79] beneficientia est illa que exhibetur nobilioribus, tuendo ipsos contra malignos eorum inimicorum[80] sive facto sive verbo, (**4**) quemadmodum fecit Homerus poeta quando statuit duos honorabiles, (**5**) scilicet Menelaum regem Athenarum et Achillem fortem, (**7**) et ex eorum opposito posuit alios duos, scilicet Paridem et Helenam (**9**) inimicos ipsorum,[81] et illos erexit in signaculum et quasi titulum laudis, inimicos vero in signum vituperii et depressionis [Paridem scilicet filium regis Troie et Helenam].[82]

(**10**) Et locutus est quod oportuit de amicis [de laude] et quod oportuit [de vituperio] de inimicis: beneficenciam erga amicos et maleficenciam erga inimicos, secundum possibilitatem que se ei offerebat.

(**11**) Etenim iuxta hanc mensura est sufficientie et defectus et superfluitatis: (**12**) cum enim non pot⟨u⟩erit quis nisi modicum et hoc totum addux⟨er⟩it, non reputabitur deficiens; (**13**) si autem amplius potuerit, cum in multis benefecerit,[83] sed multa omiserit, defectui imputabitur. (**14**) Similiter, si copiose laudis materiam habu⟨er⟩it et citra posse in laudando destiterit, culpabilis erit. Et hoc modo contingit[84] in beneficentia et retributione. (**15**) Sustinetur enim ab amico sine molestia si[85] condigna retributione non responderit vel metus alicuius occasione vel negligentia et oblivione, dummodo non frequenter fecerit, vel tempore longo in hoc non perseveraverit, etiam;[86] in quibus si modum excesserit,

---

79) Both manuscripts actually read *innobilior beneficentia*. However, this is at variance with the Arabic of 73,8, which has *wa-afḍalu l-iḥsāni l-iḥsānu ilā l-afāḍili*, *and the best [part of] benevolence is benevolence towards the best [kind of people]*. The correspondence between translation and source text can be restored by assuming that the conjunction forming the first part of the expression *et nobilior* had been written in the shape of a *7*, later misinterpreted as an *i* surmonuted by a compendium.

80) This is the Toledo manuscript reading. The Paris manuscript originally had *malignos inimicorum eorum*, which was subsequently turned in *malignos eorum inimicorum* as well.

81) The Paris manuscript reads *et inimicos ipsorum*.

82) I believe this section to be a gloss partly because it overlaps with *scilicet Paridem et Helenam* in (**7**) and partly because of its awkward syntactic position, even if the words in (**9**) may seem to cover the Arabic *son of the king of Barbar* in a fuller way. Still, the only way to preserve this Latin section would be to regard it as an authorial variant reading for the first *scilicet Paridem et Helenam* and assume that it was somehow misplaced.

83) The Paris and the Toledo manuscript read *cum in multis benefecerit*; the possibility that the original text could have been *cum vel multis benefecerit* should however be taken into account.

84) *Convenit* in the Toledo manuscript.

85) The Paris manuscript has *sed*.

86) It is not easy to see how *etiam* is to be interpreted; either we should postpone it in order to read *in quibus etiam*—which would translate the Arabic *fa-amma* (74,1)—or we should assume that it means *as well* and that it belongs to the previous phrase, even if this position would be very uncommon. However, it also occurs in 72ra22 of the Paris manuscript and in 37rc80 of the Toledo manuscript, where we can read *in his vero que necesse est esse aut que possunt esse non fit deliberatio, nec in omni possibili etiam. Quedam enim bonorum bona sunt naturaliter* ... Here *etiam* seems to translate the Arabic *ayḍan*, *as well* (18.26).

excusationem non habebit, imo beneficii feret offensam, cum amplius[87] retribuerit. (**16**) Nam quod queritur vel expectatur in beneficentia est ut perveniatur ad suppremum possibilitatis et quod indulgetur[88] in maleficencia est quod procedit a necessitate et a[89] defectu possibilitatis. (**17**) Quod ergo deficit a possibili in beneficentia est ex impotentia, quod autem pertransit necessitatem in maleficentia est ex proposito. Et quando perdurat molestatio molestantis et intenditur debilitas et metus donec pertranseat horam necessitatis,[90] adducit discordiam procul dubio.

(**18**) Etiam intellexerunt quidam eorum pro debilitate duplicitatem, hoc est frequentiam. Et intellectus fuit horum quod, cum aliquid frequenter fit, gravat, quamvis ante hoc fuerit leve.

(**19**) Causa huius diversi intellectus fuit quod per eosdem caracteres in arabico scribitur debilitas et duplicitas.

(**20**) Et exemplum eius in quo nos sumus est quod ducit assensum hominis pro voluntate sua in beneficencia. Eius enim voluntas est ut non recipiat omnino dampnum ex beneficentia erga alterum, ita quod malum aliquod ei eveniat in rebus aut in sui consistentia. (**21**) Deinde si impulerit ipsum quid [ex merito beneficii sui][91] ex hoc quod antecessit, exhibendo ei beneficium meritorium retributionis, ad receptionem dampni alicuius ex defectu in rebus vel in consistencia, mox voluntas eius insistet[92] fraudulentie. Et est ut retribuat ei defective et citra meritum prout poterit.

(**22**) Defraudabit ergo pro multo[93] retribuens modicum et pro eo quod erat communis utilitatis, aliquid proprie utilitatis et pro eo cuius erat indigens

---

87) The phrase *cum amplius retribuerit* does not mirror any part of the Arabic text. At first sight, one could be tempted to emend the text to read *cum non amplius retribuerit*, but it is better to take it to mean that additional offence would take place if, after rewarding a benefactor poorly, someone decided to add something more to the prize, because, by doing so, he would admit that he could have done the same at the right time. This line of thought has the advantages of being pursued in (**16**) and of making sense of *imo*, which introduces the previous phrase.

88) Actually, both manuscripts show *indigetur*, but this does not translate the Arabic text, nor does it allow us to establish a contraposition between *beneficentia* and *maleficentia*.

89) The Paris manuscript omits *a*.

90) *Et intendit debilitas et metus donec pertranseat horam necessitatis* is missing from the Toledo manuscript.

91) I take *ex merito beneficii sui* to be a gloss to the following *ex hoc quod antecessit, exhibendo ei beneficium meritorium retributionis*, which makes the Latin text hard to follow. Moreover, *ex merito beneficii sui* does not mirror anything in the Arabic text.

92) The Toledo manuscript reads *insistet*, while in the Paris manuscript the same reading is a correction from *insistit*.

93) Hermannus translates 74.12, that is *fa-ġāliṭahu 'an kaṯīrin mā asdāhu bi-l-qalīli*, *and he deceives with little in exchange for a big thing which he has generously done*, with *defraudabit ergo pro multo retribuens modicum* (78ra26–27): did he read *man* instead of *mā*? This option might make the text somewhat clearer.

tempore receptionis, aliquid sibi superfluum quo non indiget inceptor beneficentie erga ipsum, et universaliter conabitur ut non sit retributio ad modum recepti beneficii.

(**23**) Retributor autem ad modum recepti beneficii est qui retribuit propinquum in genere aut in quantitate et quo egens est. (**24**) Et famosum et laudabile et decens opus retributoris est ut non sit beneficus et retributor captans[94] et requirens beneficium parvum et retributionem modicam cum presto ei fuerit copiose.[95] (**25**) Et retributio quidem interdum est ut beneficium inceptivum et interdum amplior eo et interdum quid extraneum a genere ipsius simile ei in potentia et interdum defectiva. (**26**) Et qui retribuit secundum quod est ei possibile excusabilis est; qui autem citra sistit meretur redargui.

(**27**) Et aliquando in retribuendo occurrunt res non pecuniales seu possessionales, sed gesticulares, ut est[96] exilaratio amici et exacerbatio[97] inimici, et gesticulationes quarum delectabile est spectaculum et que placent, ut ludorum solacia et cetera his similia, secundum quod ex his aptus est delectari quispiam in incidentia[98] sua erga quemlibet, prout apropriatur ei eorum delectabilitas secundum suam naturam.

(**28**) Omnis enim homo delectatur in aliquo et ammiratur de aliquo, quod sibi placet, apropriato ei, aut per naturam suam aut per assuetudinem aut per experientiam ipsius. Multa enim delectant et placent propter experientiam, que, si non esset experientia, non delectarent nec placerent.

(**29**) Et huius quoque capituli seu intentionis sunt directio exhortativa et consultiva fidelitas: sunt enim beneficentia et[99] retributio quedam. Et est quidem beneficentia et eius retributiva responsio artificiosa et delectabilis valde cum sit in hora necessitatis et requisitionis sue; imo eximia est et honorabilis. (**30**) Est autem unicuique propria sibi electio sive appetitus: quidam enim appetunt victoriam, alii autem divicias et sic de singulis. (**31**) Inductiva[100] ergo credulitatum rethoricalium contra bonum et malum conquiruntur quidem ex his locis memoratis.

---

94) The original reading in the Toledo is *retributor captans*, while the Paris manuscript had *captans retributor*. Later on, each manuscript has been corrected in order to show the opposite reading. We should take *captans et requirens* as predicates of *beneficus et retributor*, so that we are confronted with two hendiadys, the first of which displays a variation between adjective and substantive.

95) *Copiosum* in the Paris manuscript.

96) The Toledo manuscript has *cum*.

97) *Et exacerbatio inimici* is not in the Toledo manuscript, but it mirrors the Arabic (75.5).

98) *Intercidentia* in the Toledo manuscript.

99) The conjunction *et* is not in the Toledo manuscript.

100) The Paris manuscript has *inducentia*.

5.2. *English translation of the Arabic version of Aristotle's* Rhetoric *31.16–32.22*

(**a**) [**p. 31**] Then he[101] who goes on and chooses a person between rational people and between the best men and women, as Ūmīrūs [i.e. Homer] chose Udūsūs [i.e. Odysseus] the Athenian, Alānā [i.e. Helen], Al-Iskandar [i.e. Alexander] and Aḫilus [i.e. Achilles].

(**b**) [**20**] And on the whole,[102] of course when he chooses to do to friends and enemies the chosen things, namely what is bad to enemies and what is good to friends, as [**p. 32**] the possibilities which have already taken place and which will easily take place on account of fear, without pain, in a short time, because what is very difficult is defined as pain through the duration of time, (**c**) if it conforms to what they prefer, either what they prefer is not a bad thing at all, or it is something which [**5**] is less good. And this [happens] whenever a mistake concerning compensations has been made, either with small things or with particular things and with the last of these things with regard to excellence. And whenever it is not in this way, but rather in the similar way, it would be between what comes close with regard to genus and power.

(**d**) Moreover, [those things] which are regarded as faulty are not destined to be completed, even when their completions are small, [achieved] less deliberately and easily, [**10**] because they, too, are possible under the same conditions of those things that happen with ease.

(**e**) However, their easy completion can be achieved either fully or for the most part, about similar things or about faulty things, like those that please friends and damage enemies (**f**) and we are surprised at them [i.e. at these things] whenever they make them according to what there is in it [i. e. in this situation] in terms of preparation and exercise, and [we are surprised] at that (**h**) whose completion may look easy [**15**] with regard to emendation and exhortation; further, at that which is sometimes praised with the addition of those things which are obtained because someone wants and longs for; and they may seem not merely pleasant, but excellent as well; (**i**) and this [is] in everyone according to what he wants and prefers: concerning the lovers of victory, that they may obtain victory; concerning the lovers [**20**] of generosity, that they may obtain generosity; concerning the lovers of wealth, that they may obtain wealth (**j**) and it is likewise for the other kinds.

---

101) The Greek ὃ (1363a17) is neuter, so that in 31.16 we would expect to read *mā* instead of *man*; Lyons' conclusion is that either the source-text had ὅν instead of ὃ, or *man* was emended into *mā*.

102) The rendering *wa-l-ǧumlata* (31.20) is rather surprising; in order to translate ὅλως (1363a19) I would rather expect an expression such as *ǧumlatan* or *bi-l-ǧumlati*.

(**k**) Concerning what is good and the things that are useful,[103] (**l**) we obtain the assents from these directions.

5.3. *English translation of* Kitāb al-Ḫiṭāba *73,7–75,15*

(**1**) Besides, among useful goods there are benevolence and reward; (**2**) indeed, it is useful in itself, while fame, good reputation and fondness are useful in another good.

(**3**) And the best aspect of benevolence is benevolence towards the best people, with help for them against their base enemies—either practical help or verbal help—(**4**) like what Ūmīrūs [i.e. Homer] [**10**] the poet did when he chose two excellent people, (**5**) namely Ṭawḏrūs king of Āṯīnīh [i.e. Athens] and Hīlānī (i.e. Helen) his daughter, and he chose Āḫīlūs [i.e. Achilles] the brave, (**6**) and he raised them as a target for praise and applause. (7) And in front of them he raised their enemy Iskandar [i.e. Alexander], son of the king of Barbar, (**8**) who was their enemy and therefore handled them roughly with blame and scorn.

(**10**) And towards friends and enemies he practiced all the benevolence that is to be practiced towards friends and caused all the damage that is to be caused to enemies, as far as he could. (**11**) And if what is expected in terms of generous activity is that which is both expected and possible, (**12**) even if it is but little and if [**15**] he later accomplishes it, there will be no deficiency.

(**13**) And if more is possible, but someone restricts himself to much less than that, it will be deemed a deficiency. (**15**) And it is likewise regarding what can be endured in fact of deficiency and harshness coming from a friend on account of him who brings about fright; it is just endured, [**p. 74**] but no one is saddened on its account as long as its duration is short and brief. And if it is prolonged and it exceeds the instant of necessity, he is hideous and the justification does not hold for him, (**16**) because what is expected in terms of benevolence is the realization of possibility, while what is forgiven in terms of harm is what comes from necessity or lack of possibility. (**17**) Hence that which is less than what is possible in terms of benevolence is a deficiency, while that which is more than what is necessary in terms of harm is an intention. And whenever [**5**] submission to misfortunes is prolonged and feebleness and fright are reinforced, so that he exceeds the instant of necessity with harshness, aversion is surely triggered.

(**18**) And some of them mistook "feebleness" for "double," that is "redoubling." And its meaning is that, whenever anything redoubles, it bores, even if before it used to be simple.

---

103) In 77va8–9 Hermannus translates both *al-ḫayr* (*what is good*) and *al-manāfiʿ* (*the things that are useful*, 32.22) with singular nouns.

(**20**) And example—inasmuch as we deal with it—is what causes man's submission towards his preference for benevolence. And indeed his will is to avoid being damaged on account of benevolence towards someone else through some ill that befalls him in property and condition. (**21**) Besides, if, concerning the entitlement to a reward [**10**] of a person who brought him some gain, someone urges away from what came before him in terms of gift and towards the fact of being damaged through a lack that would befall him in property and condition, then his preference is turned against the other [person], namely [his preference is] that that he should reward [him] with what is less than what he deserved, inasmuch as possible.

(**22**) And he deceives with little in exchange for a big thing which he has generously done, and in exchange for something whose usefulness is public with something whose usefulness is exclusive, and in exchange for what he needed when he accepted with what is redundant and which is not needed by him who initiated it with benevolence. And in general: an effort is made so that he does not reward with what is similar.

(**23**) And for what concerns him who rewards with what is similar, he is him who rewards [**15**] with what comes close in terms of genus, or with what comes close in terms of level and usefulness.

(**24**) And concerning the reason for fame, tribute and applause which stems from reward, surely he who initiates and he who rewards is not ready to a [form of] benevolence [**p. 75**] of little account or to a small reward while abundance is easy for him. (**25**) Still, what is made easier in terms of reward can sometimes be like benevolence completely and fully initiated within its own genus, it can be something more than this, it can be something outside its own genus but similar to it in terms of potentiality and it can also be wanting. (**26**) And who has done all that is possible, is justified; and who has refrained from this is to be blamed.

(**27**) And sometimes [**5**] in a reward there are things which are not payments that can be owned, but rather like a friend pleases or [like] the misery of an enemy or [like] actions of whose observation one rejoices and which are admired between jokes; and unlike them, concerning what happens to him in accordance with the observation about him made by the person who comes close to him from the place for some preparation with which he who finds an outlet towards it in his own nature sets himself apart.

(**28**) And everyone enjoys something and admires something that is fit for him, since preparation occasionally makes something pleasant and admirable, in such a way that, if it were not for it, one would not enjoy or admire it. (**29**) And in this [**10**] domain [there are] guidance and good advice as well: indeed, this is some kind of benevolence and reward. And at the arrival of the good deed and of the reward when they are needed and wished for there is a pleasant occasion, but sizeable and valuable as well. (**30**) And everyone has a special

predilection: for some people [it is] to be destined for victory, for some people to be destined for generosity, and for some people to be destined for wealth, and so on.

(**31**) And rhetorical assents within the domain of good and bad can only be obtained thanks to the aforementioned arguments.

6. Bibliography

Akasoy, Anna, and Alexander Fidora. "Hermannus Alemannus und die alia translatio der Nikomachischen Ethik." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* 44 (2002): 79–93.

Anawati, Georges. *Avicenne: la Métaphysique du Shifa'*. Paris: Vrin, 1978.

Aouad, Maroun. "La *Rhétorique*: tradition syriaque et arabe." In *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Ed. by Richard Goulet and Pierre Hadot. Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 1989: vol. I, 455–472.

Aouad, Maroun, and Marwan Rashed. "L'exégèse de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote, première partie." *Medioevo* (1997): 43–189.

Aristotle. *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*. Ed. by William D. Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

——. *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*. Ed. by Rudolf Kassel. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976.

——. *Rhetorica in versione arabica vetusta*. Ed. by ʿAbdurraḥmān Badawī. Cairo: Maktabat an-Nahḍa al-Miṣrīya, 1959.

——. *Aristotle's Ars Rhetorica: The Arabic Version*. Ed. by Malcom C. Lyons. Cambridge: Pembroke Arabic Texts, 1982.

Averroes. *Commentaire moyen à la Rhétorique d'Aristote. Édition critique du texte arabe et traduction française*. Ed. by Maroun Aouad. Paris: Vrin, 2002.

Avicenna. *Ibn Sīnā, al-šifā', la logique, VIII, Rhétorique (Al-ḫaṭābah)*. Ed. by Muhammad S. Sālim. Cairo: Imprimerie Nationale, 1954.

Avicenna. *Liber de philosophia prima vel scientia divina*. Ed by Simone Van Riet and Gérard Verbeke. Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1977–1983: lexiques.

——. *Liber tertium naturalium de generatione et corruptione*. Ed by Simone Van Riet and Gérard Verbeke. Louvain-Leiden: Peeters-Brill, 1987.

Bertolacci, Amos. "On the Manuscripts of the *Ilāhiyyāt* of Avicenna's *Kitāb al-Shifā'*." In *Islamic Thought in the Middle Ages: Studies in Text, Transmission and Translation in Honour of Hans Daiber*, ed. by Anna Akasoy and Wim Raven. Leiden: Brill, 2008, 59–76.

Boggess, William F. "Hermannus Alemannus' Rhetorical Translations." *Viator* 2 (1970): 227–250.

Consortium of the European Research Library. http://thesaurus.cerl.org/record/cnp00405030, accessed April 10, 2012.

Du Cange, Charles, Pierre Carpentier, and Louis Henschel. *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. Niort: L. Favre, 1883–1887.

Endress, Gerhard, and Dimitri Gutas. *A Greek and Arabic lexicon (GALex): materials for a dictionary of the mediaeval translations from Greek into Arabic*, Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Gutas, Dimitri. "Aspects of Literary Form and Genre in Arabic Logical Works." In *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts: The Syriac, Arabic and Medieval Latin*

Traditions, ed. by Charles Burnett. London: The Warburg Institute of the University of London, 1993, 29–76.

Hasse, Dag N. *Latin Averroes Translations of the First Half of the Thirteenth Century*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2010.

Ibn an-Nadīm. *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Ed. by Gustav L. Flügel, Johannes Roediger, and Friedrich August Müller. Leipzig: Vogel, 1872.

Kraemer, Jörg. "Arabische Homerverse." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 106 (1956): 289–316.

Lacombe, Georges. Alexander Birkenmajer, Marthe Dulong, Ezio Franceschini, and Lorenzo Minio-Paluello. *Aristoteles latinus: codices*. Cambridge: University Press, 1955.

Peters, Francis E. *Aristoteles Arabus: the Oriental Translations and Commentaries on the Aristotelian Corpus*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

Ullmann, Manfred. *Wörterbuch zu den griechisch-arabischen Übersetzungen des 9. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2002.

Vagelpohl, Uwe. *Aristotle's* Rhetoric *in the East*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008.

Watt, John W., and Maroun Aouad. "La *Rhétorique*: tradition syriaque et arabe." In *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Ed. by Richard Goulet and Pierre Hadot. Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 2003: Supplement, 219–223.

Woerther, Frédérique. "Les citations du Commentaire moyen à la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote par Averroès dans la traduction arabo-latine de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote par Hermann l'Allemand." *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph*, forthcoming.

——. "Le rôle des traductions dans les traditions textuelles: les versions arabe et arabo-latine de la *Rhétorique* d'Aristote." *Actes du colloque de la FR 33*, ed. by D. Smith. Paris: Vrin, Textes et Traditions, forthcoming.